



2 AF

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

Application Number	10/082,794
Filing Date	February 22, 2002
First Named Inventor	David Bau III
Art Unit	2192
Examiner Name	Rutten, James D.
Attorney Docket Number	109870-130096

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement

<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/
Incomplete Application
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts
under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 | <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers
<input type="checkbox"/> Petition
<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a
Provisional Application
<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation
Change of Correspondence Address
<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer
<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund
<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD | <input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC
<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board
of Appeals and Interferences
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC
(Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify
below):

Return Receipt Postcard |
|--|--|--|

Remarks

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name	Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.		
Signature			
Printed name	Robert C. Peck		
Date	August 3, 2006	Reg. No.	56,826

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature			
Typed or printed name	Yvette L. Chriscaden	Date	August 3, 2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



Attorney Reference: 109870-130096
PG No: P008

Patent

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Bau et al.

Application No.: 10/082,794

Filed: February 22, 2002

For: ANNOTATION BASED
DEVELOPMENT PLATFORM
FOR STATEFUL WEB
SERVICES

Examiner: Rutten, James D.

Art Unit: 2192 Conf. No. 2046

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited
with the United States Postal Service as **First Class Mail** in
an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents,
Washington, D.C. 20231 on this date:

August 3, 2006

DATE

Yvette L. Chriscaden

TYPED OR PRINTED NAME

Yvette L. Chriscaden

SIGNATURE

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Dear Sir:

Appellants respectfully reply to the Examiner's answer as follows:

(A) In "Response to Argument," part I, the Examiner maintains that claims 1-52 were properly provisionally rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. In particular, the Examiner notes that claim 4 of the '807 application recites "a stateful conversation between the client and the web service ..."

While Appellants continue to maintain that the rejection is improper and that no terminal disclaimer is necessary, Appellants will provide the Examiner with a terminal disclaimer if the appeal process terminates with a holding that Appellants' claims are allowable in their current form.

(B) In “Response to Argument,” part II, the Examiner maintains that claims 1-4, 10-12, 15-17, 22-24, 26, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38-39, 41, 44-46, and 48 were properly provisionally rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. In particular, the Examiner notes that the ‘492 application claims each of the elements of claims 1-4, 10-12, 15-17, 22-24, 26, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38-39, 41, 44-46, and 48 of the instant application.

While Appellants continue to maintain that the rejection is improper and that no terminal disclaimer is necessary, Appellants will provide the Examiner with a terminal disclaimer if the appeal process terminates with a holding that Appellants’ claims are allowable in their current form.

(C) In “Response to Argument,” part III, the Examiner maintains that claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 16, 17, 22, 38-39, and 44 were properly rejected as anticipated by BEA WebLogic under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). More specifically, on page 9 of the Examiner’s Answer, the Examiner asserts that Appellants impermissibly read the term “automatically” into Claim 1’s limitation of “specifying one or more declarative annotations to cause a compiler to generate one or more persistent components...” The Examiner then further maintains that BEA WebLogic teaches both declarative annotations and the generation by a compiler of one or more persistent components.

Even conceding, for the sake of argument, that the JavaBeans of BEA WebLogic are persistent components generated by a compiler, and that the JavaBean codes include declarative annotations, Appellants nonetheless maintain that BEA WebLogic simply does not teach “specifying one or more declarative annotations **to cause** a compiler to generate one or more persistent components...” (emphasis added). WebLogic merely discloses that a developer may manually cause a compiler to generate JavaBeans. Nothing in WebLogic expresses or

requires that the compiler generate the JavaBeans in response to any other cause but manual initialization by the developer.

In contrast, as claimed in claim 1, the declarative annotations **cause** the compiler to generate the persistent components. Thus, the above cited language inherently requires that declarative annotations, not a developer, be the cause of the compilation. By using the term “automatically” in previous responses, Appellants simply meant to indicate that compilation cannot be manually initiated. If compilation is manually initiated, then the declarative annotations cannot be said to “cause a compiler to generate,” as is claimed by claim 1. Accordingly, the manually initiated generation taught by WebLogic is implicitly excluded by claim 1, which inherently requires automatic generation caused by declarative annotations.

(D) In “Response to Argument,” part IV, the Examiner maintains that claims 2-3, 5-9, 12-15, 18-21, 23-37, 40-43, and 45-52 were properly rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). More specifically, the Examiner notes that Appellants’ arguments are based on the arguments that the Examiner’s §102(b) rejection was improper, and states that those §102(b) arguments are not persuasive for the reasons provided in part III of the Examiner’s Answer.

In response, Appellants continue to maintain that the other references cited by the Examiner do not cure the deficiencies of BEA WebLogic discussed above. Accordingly, for at least that reason, claims 2-3, 5-9, 12-15, 18-21, 23-37, 40-43, and 45-52 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Conclusion

As Applicant has set forth in the brief, the Examiner has erred in his rejections. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Board reverse the Examiner’s rejections.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No.
500393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. C. Peck', written over a horizontal line.

Robert C. Peck, Reg. No. 56,826
Agent for Appellant

Date: August 3, 2006

Pacwest Center
1211 SW Fifth Ave., Ste 1600-1900
Portland, Oregon 97204
Phone: (503) 222-9981,
FAX: (503) 796-2900